

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Rukshana Parvin	Team: Squad #1	CCRB Case #: 201600537	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Friday, 01/22/2016 3:30 AM	Location of Incident: corner of § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] [REDACTED].	Precinct: 73	18 Mo. SOL 7/22/2017	EO SOL 7/22/2017	
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 01/22/2016 11:25 AM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Fri, 01/22/2016 11:25 AM		
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address			
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
Witness(es)	Home Address				
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]				
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command		
1. POM Dana Ladson	10196	941282	073 PCT		
Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name		
1. POM Nelson Reyes	27566	953309	073 PCT		
Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation			
A.POM Dana Ladson	Abuse: Police Officer Dana Ladson stopped § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
B.POM Dana Ladson	Abuse: Police Officer Dana Ladson refused to provide his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
C.POM Dana Ladson	Discourtesy: Police Officer Dana Ladson spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
D.POM Dana Ladson	Off. Language: Police Officer Dana Ladson made remarks to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] based upon the perceived sexual orientation of § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			

Case Summary

On January 22, 2016 at approximately 3:30 a.m., PO Dana Ladson and PO Nelson Reyes, of the 73rd Precinct Anti-Crime Team, were patrolling in the vicinity of § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn when they observed § 87(2)(b) with an unleashed pit-bull. PO Ladson and PO Reyes approached § 87(2)(b) while remaining inside of the police RMP and PO Ladson requested his ID (**Allegation A**). § 87(2)(b) asked PO Ladson for his name and shield number and PO Ladson allegedly refused (**Allegation B**). PO Ladson went back inside of the RMP and returned with a summons for an unlicensed dog and handed it to § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) complained about the summons. PO Ladson allegedly replied “fucking faggot” (**Allegations C and D**).

There was no video footage for this incident.

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

Mediation was offered to § 87(2)(b) and he opted to not mediate this case § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(b) did not file a Notice of Claim for this incident [01 Board Review].

[§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

This is the first CCRB complaint involving § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)

This is the fourth CCRB complaint filed against PO Ladson during his nine year tenure, with no allegations substantiated against him. He was the subject of one previous allegation each of stop, question, and refusal to provide name and shield. The stop and name and shield allegations (200805070 and 201509857) were unsubstantiated, while the question allegation (200805070) was closed as victim unavailable.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A- Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Dana Ladson stopped § 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b) was standing across the street from his residence and ordering food at a deli. His mother’s pit bull was with him. § 87(2)(b) testified that his pit bull was on a leash however, the leash was dragging on the ground. As § 87(2)(b) was ordering at the deli window he noticed a dark grey 2016 Chevy Impala drive by. The Impala drove by again, then stopped. PO Ladson rolled his window down and asked § 87(2)(b) for his ID and § 87(2)(b) asked why? PO Ladson replied that his dog is off the leash. § 87(2)(b) explained that it was 3 a.m. and he was tired. PO Ladson stated he was also tired and § 87(2)(b) handed him his ID. [04 Board Review].

PO Ladson stated that he and his partner, PO Reyes, were patrolling the area when they observed § 87(2)(b) with an unlicensed and unleashed dog. The dog had a leash on the collar but it was dragging on the floor. § 87(2)(b) and the unleashed dog were standing in front of a bodega. PO Ladson stated that less than 10 people were also standing around the bodega at the time. PO Ladson described the dog as brown with white pit-bull. PO Ladson approached § 87(2)(b) and asked for identification and also asked § 87(2)(b) to put the dog on a leash. PO Ladson stated that that dog did not have any tags on the collar. PO Ladson did not ask for a dog license. However, PO Ladson issued § 87(2)(b) a summons for an unlicensed dog. PO Ladson stated that he used his discretion to give the unlicensed summons and not the unleashed dog summons [05 Board Review].

PO Reyes stated that he and PO Ladson were patrolling the area and they observed § 87(2)(b) with an unleashed pit-bull. There was a leash with § 87(2)(b) but not on the dog. There were other people waiting to purchase items from the bodega and PO Reyes stated that that is dangerous because the dog could have bitten someone. Officers approached § 87(2)(b) with the police RMP. PO Ladson asked § 87(2)(b) for his ID and asked him to put a leash on the dog. A summons was issued ultimately for an unlicensed dog as PO Reyes provided the code for that to PO Ladson. PO Reyes stated that two summonses could have been issued as the dog was unleashed and unlicensed but the officers used their discretion and only issued one summons. PO Reyes determined that the dog was unlicensed because it did not have any tags on the collar [06 Board Review].

As per the New York City Health Code, Section 161.05 (b), it states that a person who owns, possesses or controls a dog shall not permit it to be in any public place or in any open or unfenced area abutting on a public place unless the dog is effectively restrained by a leash or other restraint not more than six feet long [07 Board Review]. Additionally, Section 161.04 (a) and (b) require dogs to be both licensed wearing the applicable tags on its collar. [Board Review 07 and 08]

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation B- Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Dana Ladson refused to provide his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that he asked PO Ladson for his name and shield number. PO Ladson responded that the information would be on the ticket. § 87(2)(b) was able to see a shield around PO Ladson's neck however, it was turned around backward. § 87(2)(b) observed PO Ladson writing the ticket but was unable to read his name [04 Board Review].

PO Ladson stated that when § 87(2)(b) provided his ID, he asked PO Ladson for his name and shield number. PO Ladson verbally provided his name and shield number. § 87(2)(b) responded "fuck you; suck my dick." PO Ladson stated during his interview that his tax number and his precinct would be on the summons though he did not tell § 87(2)(b) that he could be identified by the information on the summons [05 Board Review].

PO Ladson brought a copy of the handwritten summons to his interview. It showed his tax number as 941282 and listed his command as the 73rd Precinct. However, his name was written as “PO L” and there is no section on the summons for a shield number [09 Board Review].

PO Reyes stated that § 87(2)(b) asked PO Ladson for his name and shield number, and that PO Ladson explained that the information would be written on the summons. According to PO Reyes, PO Ladson provided the summons and pointed to his information. § 87(2)(b) did not make any complaint that he was unable to read the information on the summons [06 Board Review].

Patrol Guide procedure 203-09, states that officers must courteously and clearly state their rank, name, shield number and command, or otherwise provide the information, to anyone who requests it. The officer must allow the person ample time to note this information [10 Board Review].

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation C – Discourtesy: Police Officer Dana Ladson spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation D- Offensive Language: Police Officer Dana Ladson made remarks to § 87(2)(b) based upon the perceived sexual orientation of § 87(2)(b)

Upon its receipt, § 87(2)(b) complained about receiving a ticket for an unlicensed dog. In response PO Ladson replied, “fucking faggot” [04 Board Review]. § 87(2)(b) subsequently told PO Ladson to “suck a dick.”

PO Ladson and PO Reyes consistently stated that neither officer called § 87(2)(b) a “fucking faggot.” Additionally, they testified that neither of them used profanity or made any reference to § 87(2)(b) sexual orientation during the incident [05 and 06 Board Review].

§ 87(2)(g)

Squad: 1

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date

Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date